

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

VS.

CRIMINAL NO. 5:17-CR-1-DCB-LGI

VERONICA THOMAS

DEFENDANT

ORDER

BEFORE THE COURT is Defendant Veronica Thomas's ("Defendant") Motion for Copies ("Motion") [ECF No. 152]. The Court, having examined the Motion, the record, the applicable legal authority, and being fully informed in the premises, finds as follows:

In her Motion, Defendant requests a copy of her "Factual Resume Sentencing Calculation and [her] Plea Agreement." [ECF No. 152]. Defendant vaguely asserts that these documents concern her case. Id.

An indigent defendant has no constitutional right to acquire a free copy of her transcript or other court records for use in a collateral proceeding.¹ See United States v. MacCollom, 426 U.S. 317, 325-26 (1976); United States v. Peralta-Ramirez, 266 Fed. Appx. 360 (5th Cir. 2008). Further, courts are generally reluctant to grant requests for unlimited copies of

¹ 28 U.S.C. § 753(f) provides a narrow, statutory exception to this principle, yet is inapplicable in this case.

documents at its own expense. See Arrington v. Scott, No. 1:12-cv-529, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 39725 *1-2 (W.D. Mich. 2013) (denying a pro se prisoner's request for free copies of several documents filed in his case, because "[i]ndigent civil litigants are not entitled to free copies, but instead must bear their own litigation expenses").

Defendant has not demonstrated that free copies of court documents are necessary, and the Court is not obligated to provide such copies under these circumstances. As such, the Court will deny Defendant's Motion.

For the foregoing reasons, Defendant's Motion [ECF No. 152] shall be DENIED.

ACCORDINGLY,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant's Motion for Copies [ECF No. 152] is DENIED.

SO ORDERED, this 8th day of May, 2023.

/s/ David Bramlette
DAVID C. BRAMLETTE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE